

### III. REMARKS

This document is being submitted in response to the final Office Action mailed by the Patent Office on March 8, 2007. In the present application, claims 11-20 and 22-46 are pending, claims 11-20 and 22-40 are withdrawn from consideration, claims 41, 42, 45 and 46 stand as rejected, and claims 43 and 44 stand as objected to by the Patent Office. In Response to the Office Action of March 8, 2007, the Applicant has cancelled claims 41-42 and 46 without prejudice, amended claims 43-45, and added new claims 48-49. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in light of the amendments and remarks made herein.

#### 35 USC § 103(a)

On pages 3-6 of the Office Action of March 8, 2007, the Patent Office rejected claims 41, 45 and 46 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beloian ('608) in view of Miller ('334) or Macleish ('899). On pages 5-6 of the Office Action of March 8, 2007, the Patent Office rejected claims 41, 42 and 45 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller ('499). In response to these rejections, claims 41-42 and 46 have been cancelled, rendering moot any further discussion thereof.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

On page 6 of the Office Action of March 8, 2007, the Patent Office indicated claims 43 and 44 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. The Patent Office does not reference any specific 35 U.S.C. § 112 objections/rejections in this Office Action; therefore the Applicant assumes that the Patent Office is referring to the informalities listed on Page 6 with regard to claims 41-46 (see paragraph 6 of the Office Action), and the required corrections have been made. Claim 43 has been amended to include all of the limitations of independent claim 41 and to be grammatically consistent with the embodiment of the invention that includes an array of prismatic elements formed into a semi-arc. Claims 44 and 45 have been amended to depend directly from amended claim 43, and are believed to be allowable because they depend directly from a claim that has been indicated to be

allowable. New claims 47-49 have been added, and because these claims also depend from a claim that has been indicated to be allowable by the Patent Office (i.e., amended claim 43), new claims 47-49 are also believed to be allowable. No new matter has been added as new claims 47-49 are directed to certain basic aspects of the invention that were included in the application as originally filed (see FIGS. 7a-c and 8, for example).

Conclusion

For the reasons stated herein, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and the Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**Date:** August 7, 2007

/Courtney J. Miller/  
Reg. No. 45,366  
(614) 719-2858  
(614) 469-4653 (fax)  
cmiller@mwncmh.com